

REMARKS

Claims 1-16, 18-55, and 58-61 are pending in this application. Claims 17, 56, and 57 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicant notes the Examiner's indication that claims 5-16, 28-39, and 48-55 are allowed, and that claims 18, 22, 40-47, and 58 contain allowable subject matter. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 40-47 have been amended to address the Examiner's specific concerns under Section 112, second paragraph, and are now consistent with the Examiner's indication of allowance. Claims 18, 22, and 58 have been rewritten in independent form to include all of the features of their respective base claims and any intervening claims, as suggested by the Examiner, and therefore are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Applicant has added new claims 59-61. New claims 59 and 60 are supported throughout the original disclosure, including at the paragraph bridging pages 37-38. New claims 59 and 60 depend from claim 54, which has been identified as containing allowable subject matter. The subject matter of new claim 61 is supported in the original disclosure at, for example, the paragraph bridging pages 38-39. Claim 61 is discussed in detail below.

Approval and entry of the above claim amendments are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 23 and 40-47 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims, prior to amendment, possess adequate definiteness and conciseness to comply with the mandate of Section 112. Nonetheless, in order to advance prosecution and address rejections, which incidentally properly could have been

characterized as informalities or claim objections, Applicant has amended the claims to address the Examiner's specific concerns. It is respectfully submitted that all claims are in full compliance with Section 112.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,057,282 to Kidd.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify that the trailer assembly section forming the upper surface of the enclosed compartment comprises the closable access member accessible from above the bed. The amendment to claim 1 is supported in the original disclosure by, for example, Fig. 8. The claimed feature is neither disclosed in nor reasonably suggested by Kidd, which employs an end wall as its closable access member. The location of the closable access member at the top of the folded bed subassembly permits transport of items that are bulkier than the compartment. As shown in Figures 8 and 15, for example, the trailer may be transported with the top access member(s) in an open position, thereby allowing large, especially tall, stored items to protrude from the compartment through the open access members during transport. Also, the top access member permits items to be quickly dumped into the trailer from above.

Claims 2-4 and new claim 61 depend from claim 1, and include the same distinguishing feature. Further, the additional limitations of claim 61 further distinguish it from Kidd. The added subject matter of claim 61, i.e., access doors at the side and top of the folded bed subassembly, is neither disclosed in nor reasonably suggested by Kidd. The presence of two

access doors as recited in claim 61 facilitates loading and unloading of bulky items. These benefits are lacking in Kidd. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 24-27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,786,073 to Harper.

Applicant respectfully submits that Harper fails to disclose a trailer assembly having forward and aft sections movably coupled to opposite ends of an intermediate section for serving as second and third bottom portions in the extended position, and side and end walls surrounding a compartment in the folded configuration, as recited in claim 24. The foldable trailer assembly of Harper does not form a compartment as defined in claim 24. Claims 25-27 depend from claim 24, and include the same distinguishing features thereof.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 17 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,239,258 to Burriss in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,259,720 to Lobner.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection, but to expedite prosecution has cancelled claim 17 and rewritten allowable claim 18 in independent form. Having rendered this rejection moot, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 19-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burriss and Lobner, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,585,285 to Koch.

As amended, claims 19-21 depend from claim 18, which the Examiner indicated contains allowable subject matter. Because claims 19-21 incorporate all of the distinguishing features of claim 18, it is respectfully submitted that claims 19-21 are also allowable for the same reasons that claim 18 is allowable, and for the additional reason that the added subject matter of claims 19-21 is not reasonably suggested by the applied art as a whole. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 23 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burris in view of Lobner and Koch, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,126,324 to Browning.

Claim 23 depends from claim 19, which as amended now depends from claim 18, which has been found to contain allowable subject matter. Because claim 23 incorporates all of the distinguishing features of claim 18, it is respectfully submitted that claim 23 also is allowable for the same reasons that claim 18 is allowable, and for the additional reason that the added subject matter of claim 23 is not taught by the applied art as a whole. For these reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 56 and 57 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burris in view of Koch.

This rejection has been rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 56 and 57. Claim 58 has been rewritten in independent format.

If, after reviewing the above, the Examiner believes any issues remain unresolved, the favor of an Examiner interview is requested and the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned, by telephone, to schedule same.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David S. Taylor

Registration No. 39,045

Tel. No. (301) 896 0600

Fax. No. (301) 896-0607

November 28, 2005

Berenato, White & Stavish, LLC
6550 Rock Spring Drive
Suite 240
Bethesda, MD 20817